



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XXVIII.—*On the Classification of the Races of Man.*

By JOHN CRAWFURD, Esq., President.

I PROPOSE in this paper to explain the views which I have myself been led to entertain respecting the Classifications of Man, and may state at once that the conclusion I have come to is that mankind consists of many originally created species, and that the hypothesis of unity of race is without foundation.

The properties in which the different races or species of men, however otherwise differing, agree, are these:—There is a general accord in outward form and anatomical structure; the periods of gestation, of infancy, of boyhood, of puberty, of maturity, of decay, and of death, are essentially the same. The hybrids of any two races, however apparently remote, are invariably fertile.

The physical characters and mental endowments of man are so different and so remote from those of even the most highly organised of the lower animals, that it is seldom that any analogy between them will hold good. For example: The period of gestation with oxen is nine months, and it is the same with man; but the age of puberty with the ox is attained at about fourteen months, while it takes as many years to reach it with man. The ox has the bulk and strength of many men, but his length of life hardly exceeds one-third of that of man. The period of gestation with the horse is by two months more than with man, and he attains his full strength in about one-half the time which it takes man to reach the age of puberty, and yet his life does not exceed one-half that of man. The period of gestation with the elephant is by two-thirds longer than with man, and its bulk is equal to, at least, thirty men, but the duration of life is only the same with that of man.

The time for the union of the sexes with the lower animals is confined to specific seasons; with man it is left to his reason, and is nearly unlimited. The period of fecundity with mankind ends when life is little more than half over, so as to leave many years for the care and protection of the long childhood of the offspring. With the lower animals it extends to close on the termination of life, because the time required for the safety of the offspring is brief. With man, the care of the parents for their offspring is continued for their whole lives, and extends even to third and fourth generations. With the lower animals it wholly ceases when it is no longer necessary to their safety. With man, both parents take an equal interest in the offspring, while with the lower animals it is for the most part one only that does so.

The immeasurable superiority of man over the most highly

gifted of the lower animals depends chiefly on his brain and its ministers, the hands, the latter being organs peculiar to him. By nature, man is unclothed and unarmed, and his food requires preparation. His innate ingenuity enables him to supply these wants, and necessity exercises and whets it. Had nature, on the contrary, furnished him with arms, clothing, and food, he would be reduced to the level of the brutes, only more astute than they.

Man is distinguished from the lower animals by his power of combination for a common purpose, a faculty possessed but in a very minor degree by a few of the lower animals. It is this power which enables him—physically weak as he is—to tame the elephant and to destroy the lion. He possesses the faculty of accumulating and hoarding knowledge, and handing that knowledge down from generation to generation. The lower animals in the wild state undergo no change from generation to generation, and if in the domestic they transmit to their posterity some peculiar properties, this has always been the work of man. The asses represented on the monuments of Egypt forty ages ago were, without doubt, as patient and occasionally as stubborn as those of the same country in the present day. Our living tame elephants are not more sagacious than were those which Porus brought against Alexander or Pyrrhus against the Romans; but the men who composed the little armies whose baggage they recently carried to Delhi and Lucknow would have made very short work with the Greeks of Alexander or Pyrrhus.

Most of the lower animals have a language of their own; but they are mere interjections to express pleasure, pain, or anger. The language of man at his creation must have been similar to, although of a somewhat higher order, since he could laugh and weep—attributes peculiar to him. It is his brain, and not any peculiar formation of his organs of speech, that has enabled man to construct language—properly so called. That languages are human creations can hardly be doubted, when we consider the vast number which exist, most frequently differing from each other in words, in structure, and in sound.

I need hardly add that the religious sentiment is peculiar to man. It is, indeed, a necessary consequence of his power of contemplation, and accordingly we find it to exist in one form or another in every social condition; grovelling in the savage, sanguinary or intolerant in the barbarian,—tolerant and enlightened only in the civilized man, and not, indeed, always even with him.

That the many separate and distinct races of man, when there has been no commixture, are originally created species,

and not mere varieties of a single family,—such abnormal varieties as we find to spring up occasionally among the domestic animals, and even with man himself, although more rarely, there are many facts to show. The union of any two of the most opposite races of man results in a hybrid partaking equally of the character of both parents, just as the common mule partakes of the qualities of the horse and ass. The only difference is that the human hybrid is always fertile, and that the animal hybrid is usually unfruitful. The infertility of the latter, however, is by no means constant, and with very closely allied species of the same genus, the hybrid is as fertile as the human.

Several examples of the fertility of crosses of closely allied species of the lower animals can be adduced. The crosses of all dogs are as fertile as their parents; and when we consider that wild dogs, differing from each other, are found in India and Australia, and that native dogs were found in America, Arctic, Temperate, and Tropical, it seems hard to believe that all the dogs of the world, in their countless varieties, sprang from a single species. Of the bovine family, not fewer than ten species still exist in the wild state; and out of these, at least four unite with the domestic cattle to the production of a fertile hybrid. Several wild species of the goose and duck produce fertile hybrids with the domestic poultry of the same families.

No two species of man are so remote from each other as are the horse and the ass, or any other two species of the lower animals of the same family, the offspring of which are sterile mules, and hence all human hybrids are fertile. Man constitutes a genus of which all the species, however otherwise different, are, in so far as the union of the sexes are concerned, precisely the same; consequently an unfruitful hybrid would be with him an impossible monster.

The union of the highest and lowest species of the human race yields an intermediate progeny, inferior to the first, and superior to the last. The offspring of a Scandinavian and a Negro is inferior to the Scandinavian, and superior to the Negro. The offspring of an Englishman and an Australian degrades the Englishman, and somewhat improves the Australian. The Mestizo is much inferior to the Spaniard, but much superior to the Red Indian. The result of the union of a Chinese and a Malay—one of frequent occurrence—is a deterioration in the Chinese and an improvement in the Malay.

The union of closely allied species of the human race produces no appreciable change in the offspring. This applies to all the different races of the European family. The people of Italy have suffered no degradation from a large admixture of

Greek and Teutonic blood, nor the inhabitants of France from an admixture of Italian and German blood ; nor the people of England from a still larger of the latter.

On the subject of commixture, however, it is to be observed, that even in the union of the most opposite races, unless there be a fresh infusion of the blood of one of them, the original admixture disappears in about the fourth generation. Thus the great-grandchild of a Negress, by an European, without any fresh African blood, is not easily distinguishable from an European. In such a case where the races that commingle are nearly allied, a return to the character of the predominant stock is, of course, much quicker. Applying this fact to the commixture of nations of different but approximating races effected by conquest, it will occur that the conquerors, being always few in comparison with the conquered, the effect of the former in modifying the physical character of the latter must quickly cease, and in time become inappreciable. Thus the Northern Asiatic nations who conquered the Hindus and held them in subjection for seven centuries were of a different race from the Hindus, and compared with them, very few in number ; and now, through intermixture, those claiming to be the descendants of the conquerors can rarely be distinguished from the aboriginal inhabitants. For the same reason, the influx of the Northern nations has probably produced very little change in the personal form, for example, of the Italians, who are probably at the present time very much what they were in the days of the Scipios.

Angles, Jutes, Saxons, and Danes poured into our own country for centuries, but they only came in boat-loads ; and, although comparatively numerous, must at all times have been much inferior in number to the native inhabitants. The probability, then, is that we are more Britons than Teutons by pedigree, although, believing ourselves purely the latter, we call ourselves Anglo-Saxons. At the best we are but hybrids, yet, probably, not the worse for that.

Among the lower animals in the wild state, no hybrids are ever produced, and something similar to this, although from a very different cause, is found to be the case in the rude state of human society. There is here a repugnance, amounting, indeed, to hostility, which prevents it. Thus the negroes and fairer people of the Philippine Islands have immemorially dwelt in the same country without producing an intermediate race. There is no disposition to intermix between the negroes and the fairer people of the Polynesian Islands, although close neighbours, and consequently we see no mixed race. The Esquimaux and Red Indians, and the Caffres and Hottentots,

although neighbours, do not intermix. It is only, indeed, in advanced and very artificial states of society that such mixed races are produced.

The advocates of Unity have argued that all the varieties of the races of man originated in such abnormal diversities as are occasionally known to spring up. This hypothesis will not bear examination. They do not point out the primordial stock from which the varieties have sprung; and it is admitted that within the range of history no such changes have actually taken place. The races, as far as history carries us, are now the same as they were in the earliest antiquity. As far as we can determine, the modern Copts do not differ from the men represented on the monuments of Egypt, nor do the modern Nubians differ from the Nubians of the same monuments. The Assyrians of the monuments of Nineveh are such Assyrians as may be seen in the same locality at the present day. The Hindus of North-Western India, as described by the cotemporaries or successors of Alexander, are, as far as we can judge, the Hindus of the same country at the present hour. Under the name of Seiks, they were lately seen gallantly fighting our battles under the walls of Pekin. Roman statues representing real personages two thousand years back are genuine portraits of many modern Italians. The authors of the inspired writings themselves seem to have been impressed with a belief in the unchangeableness of races, for one of them, computed to have written some five-and-twenty centuries ago, implies that the colour of the Ethiopian is as indelible as the spots of the leopard.

The variety which is known to exist in the different species of the lower animals, but more especially in those that are domesticated, has been adduced in illustration of the hypothesis of unity. But it is evident that any analogy between these animals and a being so incomparably remote from them as man can be of little value, not to say that we almost daily see before our eyes varieties springing up among some of the former, while history may be searched in vain for a single example of the origin of a new race of man.

Even among the lower animals the capacity of yielding varieties widely differs. The ass and camel, two of the animals longest enslaved by man, vary very little. The horse and dog, perhaps their contemporaries in domestication, produce endless varieties. The varieties in the ox are almost infinite, whereas the Indian buffalo varies little in size or form, being always either black or white. Scarcely any variety at all occurs in the elephant, immemorially bred in the domestic state in some countries of the East, for the rarity of "the white elephant," a mere albino too, is such that it is not worth naming. The

varieties in the common fowl, the pigeon, and duck are endless: the goose is always either grey or white; the domestic swan is subject to no variation at all; and the same may be said of the guinea fowl, although as familiar to the ancient Romans as to ourselves.

Among the congenital varieties which now and then spring up in man, the Albino is that chiefly insisted on as evidence of the process by which the present diversity of races may have sprang from one stock. The Albino is a mere defect consisting in an absence of the colouring matter in the skin, the hair, and the eyes, its want in the latter being accompanied by imperfect vision. It is no more a natural variety of man than is hare-lip, or supernumerary fingers and toes. Like these, and several other congenital aberrations from the normal type, it may or may not be inherited. The offspring of an Albino negro and natural negro will be either a black negro or a negro wanting the colouring matter, and never a true hybrid or mulatto—a being partaking of the qualities of both parents. Such deformities as the Albino, it is evident, are far more likely to die out than to be perpetuated to the formation of a new race of mankind, and in fact they do die out, and spring up only rarely and sporadically—again to disappear.

Albinos in the lower animals have been quoted in illustration as showing how varieties in man may, as with them, have arisen. The white elephant and white deer are probably true Albinos, for with both there is defective sight; but it is certain that our ordinary domestic white varieties are not Albinos at all, for with them there is no defective vision nor defect in the integuments corresponding with the abnormal condition of the skin in the human Albino. The white ox, the white mallard, the white cock, the white rabbit, are as perfect varieties as the black ones of the same animals, neither the black nor the white being in these cases the original colours. While the female of the domestic goose is almost always grey, approaching nearest to the original colour, the male is almost always white; but he is not an Albino, for in size, strength, and power of vision he is at least equal to the female.

Dr. Prichard has founded upon the abnormal Albino one of the three classes as to colour into which he has thought proper to divide mankind, calling it the leucous or white, the other two being the melanous or black and the xanthous or yellow. A greater perversion of fact in support of a theory it would, in my judgment, be difficult to imagine than that of converting an accidental deformity of rare occurrence into a permanent order of nature, for the attempt literally amounts to nothing less than this.

The distribution of the species of the human family over the earth seems to bear a striking analogy to that of plants and animals. In these the genera are often the same, but the species for the most part wholly different in different localities. In the same climates and the same altitudes the animals, for example, are generally different in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia. The innumerable apes of Asia, Africa, and America are, for example, all distinct from each other. With the exception of the dog, not one of our domesticated animals was found in America or Australia, but they thrive in both just as well as in their native countries. The cause of this seemingly capricious distribution, although without doubt a good and wise one, is a mystery far beyond our power of comprehension. It is the same with the races of man, for we find the five continents inhabited by men as different from one another as their respective lower animals. At the same distance from the Equator we find fair Greeks, yellow Chinese, and black Australians. As far as climate will allow—and the experiment has been tried—the races of different continents thrive and multiply in lands which are not their native ones. In America the white man prospers in countries of which the native inhabitants were all red men; and they thrive equally well in Australia, of which the aborigines were all black. The negro of tropical Africa lives, labours, and multiplies in temperate America. The Arab—a native of tropical and sub-tropical Asia—colonised Egypt, the southern shores of Africa, and, at one time, even Spain; and now we have the yellow Chinese exercising their laborious industry in America and Australia—the native abode of the red and the black man.

Migration has been referred as a cause adequate to account for the dispersion of mankind from a single stock and locality over nearly the whole earth. The most superficial examination, however, will soon satisfy us that the cause is wholly inadequate. A tribe prepared to migrate must have before it a clear open field, unobstructed by forests, mountain ranges, broad rivers, wide seas, and hostile neighbours. It must have attained a certain amount of civilization, implying the possession of a store of food with means of transport—cattle, or waggons, if the route were by land, and stout boats if by sea. It was only after they had become possessed of oxen, horses, sheep, and camels, with wheel-carriages, that the hordes of Tartary performed those migrations and conquests so famous in history. Rivers and mountain chains are obstacles sufficient to confine the rude inhabitants of America to very narrow localities. Hence the Americans, although all of the same race, were found to consist of many nations speaking distinct languages,

who knew only their next neighbours, and these but as enemies. The exceptions were the Mexicans and Peruvians, and these had attained such strength by civilization as enabled them to spread, while the land was a clear unobstructed field for their enterprise. In a word, they had the power to migrate, and they did so.

The same race of man, the Polynesian—identified by the possession of the same physical form and the same language—is found scattered from the Sandwich group to New Zealand, and from the Friendly Isles to Easter Island over full sixty degrees of latitude and ninety of longitude. This wide diffusion of one race could only have taken place through migration, even supposing it to have been effected gradually and step by step through intermediate islands. The people that effected this must, before their enterprise, whether it was the result of chance or premeditation, have attained a considerable measure of civilization. This they had actually accomplished when Europeans first saw them, for they were in possession of stout capacious boats, of the yam, the batata, the dog, the hog, and common fowl, with a skill in navigation which enabled them to perform voyages of wonderful length for rude men.

But the migrations through which the earth is supposed to have been peopled from a single stock are very different from these, and, indeed, necessarily of a very miraculous character. They are supposed to have taken place shortly after the creation of man; and when he was without arts or knowledge. Very few countries when first discovered have been found without inhabitants, and these often of distinct and peculiar races. Madeira, the Azores, the Cape de Verdes, Mauritius, and Bourbon, are the most remarkable exceptions.

Notwithstanding this well attested fact, almost every country is imagined by one theorist or another to have been originally without human inhabitants, and to have been peopled from some other country far or near, so as to restrict the first man to a single spot somewhere or another, for no one has ventured to specify the primordial locality any more than the primordial race—to say whether the first was a temperate or a tropical region, or the last black, brown, yellow, or fair. I may give a few instances. Ireland is supposed to have had no inhabitants until peopled by migrations from Britain and Spain, and even Britain itself is imagined to have been uninhabited until peopled from the neighbouring continent. The continent of Australia, although its inhabitants be a peculiar race, wholly different from all other men—although its nearest neighbours in one quarter be Papuans and in another Malaysians, and although even now without boats, and crossing their own rivers only on

rude rafts, is fancied to have been peopled from some far land. Some word-catchers, on some fancied resemblance of lingual sounds, have even ventured to name the parent land of the Australians—namely, the extreme southern end of Hindustan, although the Tamils who inhabit that country bear far less resemblance to Australians than they do to Europeans, and although the two races are separated by three thousand miles of open ocean, which no Hindu has ever been known to have crossed.

Even the Hindus themselves are imagined by the theorists of migration to be emigrants from some country or another, while the wild tribes of Hindustan, who are very like Hindus, and very unlike all other people, are fancied to be its only aboriginal inhabitants. All this is insisted on in the teeth of the well ascertained fact that no such people as Hindus now exist, or are ever known to have existed, beyond the limits of the country they now inhabit.

The late Sir John Barrow went even a step in extravagance beyond this; and, although with personal experience of both races, pronounced the Hottentots to be a colony of Chinese, exhibiting a coloured engraving of each people to show how close, in his fancy, was the resemblance between them.

But the theory of peopling countries by migration has been carried to the greatest excess in respect to the New World. It abounds in animal life peculiar to itself, but the Creator is supposed to have made man a special exception. The late learned and laborious Dr. Prichard—to whom we are greatly indebted for his accumulation of ethnological facts, but very little for his reasoning on them—has adopted this theory in all its extravagance. After truly admitting that the arts and knowledge of the Americans down to the very construction of their languages were indigenous, he insists (to use his own words) that “it leaves us still at liberty to suppose that the first inhabitants of the New World were not the offspring of an American soil, but that they were people who wandered from the old continent in the earliest ages after the creation of mankind, bringing with them in the frail canoes in which they may have passed the Northern Pacific, or in their toilsome migration over Polar Seas none of the improvements of art, not even the first acquirements of pastoral or agricultural life.”

This monstrous supposition is hardly worth the trouble of a serious refutation. Here we have a people without any arts whatever—even, indeed, before they had framed a language—passing from Asia to America, either over the ice and snow of the Arctic Circle or by crossing the broad Pacific. If they passed to America within the Arctic Circle, they must, in their

helpless condition, have travelled over a region habitable only by Esquimaux, men created like the Polar bear to live in it, and in which our recent voyagers assure us that not even the neighbouring Red Man can live. If the emigrants went by the Pacific, that would imply a voyage in its narrowest part of a thousand miles, an achievement which certainly could not be performed in "frail canoes", or any canoes whatsoever possessed by savages. If the imaginative author had asserted that the transit of the Pacific had been effected by bold, strong swimming, instead of by frail canoes, he would not have been more wide of truth and probability. But the ingenious author forgets that the artless people whom he describes ought not to have had canoes at all. The Australians, in a far more advanced state of society than the helpless savages whom he imagines, have, as already noticed, no canoes to this day.

The Polynesian islanders are possessed of stout boats, possess considerable maritime skill, have food fit for sea-stock, and the ocean between them and America is a mild and temperate sea compared to the Pacific in high latitudes, but they have never reached America. I need hardly add that no race of man exists in Asia resembling the Red Man of America, as peculiar to the New World as its bisons, its panthers, and its turkeys.

Climate, with change of locality and of social condition, have been reckoned among the causes which have contributed to the formation of varieties in mankind, but actual experience, as far as it reaches, is at direct variance with this supposition. As long as the race continues unmixed, no change of climate appears to make any essential change in it. Negroes from equatorial Africa have been settled in the temperate regions and high table lands of America for near three centuries without undergoing any appreciable physical change. A colony from the temperate parts of Persia has been settled for a thousand years in inter-tropical India, and keeping themselves strictly unmixed, they still retain the physical form of Persians, and probably differ in no material respect from the contemporaries of Cyrus and Artaxerxes. The Spanish race has been settled within tropical America for three centuries and a half, but their Creole or pure descendants are in complexion and personal form in no essential point different from the Spaniards of old Spain. The Danes and Norwegians who have been settled in Greenland for more than two centuries are still of the genuine Teutonic race, whereas, had there been any virtue in change of climate, they ought by this time to have made some approach to the Esquimaux, who are the native inhabitants of the land.

The Turks of Europe have been quoted as an example of the alteration in physical form which climate, and change of locality,

and social condition are capable of effecting. The alteration, however, it is obvious, is the result of intermixture with the conquered people far more numerous than themselves. By intermixture with Greeks, they have come to resemble Greeks, just as a branch of the same people have come to resemble Hindus.

That the races of man when originally called into existence were suited to the respective climates and localities they were created to inhabit is consistent with the order and wisdom of nature. It is, however, of the nature of the different races to have a less or more extensive geographical range. The range of the Esquimaux would seem to be confined to the hyperborean region, beyond which they are never seen; and it is as difficult to imagine them living under the equator as it is to fancy Malays, who in physical form bear them a considerable resemblance, to exist within the Arctic circle.

That different races of man have different capacities for withstanding vicissitudes of climate is very obvious, although changes of climate make no alteration in their physical form. The same race inhabits Tierra del Fuego, tropical America, and the shores of Hudson's Bay. The congenial range of the African negro probably does not go beyond thirty degrees of the equator. The Hindu has probably about the same range. Beyond this range neither of them could live and multiply. The Chinese is one of the races that has the most extensive range, for we find it labouring and flourishing at the equator in Sumatra, while it pushes colonies into Manchoo Tartary, all the while undergoing no change of physical form,—very little, indeed, even when partially intermixing with strange populations. No flourishing and prosperous community of the different races of the European family has ever existed in a lower latitude than 36° , but certainly there has never been an opportunity of giving the experiment a fair trial.

From all the facts which I have now stated, the conclusion at which I think we must arrive, and it is the same as that of the great majority of European writers, is, that man consists of a single genus composed of many species more or less closely allied. To distinguish all these species, and to describe them in clear and appropriate language, as naturalists do the species of the genera of the lower animals, is difficult, if not, indeed, impossible. The reasons are obvious: some of the races are so nearly allied that they pass into each other by such shades as to defy description. In some cases, again, confusion has been introduced by the intermixture of two or more closely allied races, a cause which has been most in operation with the most civilized nations, because they alone had the power of effecting great migrations and great conquests.

But the greatest difficulty in distinguishing species arises from the fact of man being, even in the lowest state of society, in the condition which, in speaking of the lower animals, we call the domestic, and consequently subject, even within each species, to the endless variety induced by domestication. To such an extent does this cause of variety proceed, that no two individuals are ever born alike, while individuals of one species often occur, diverging so far from its normal type as to seem to belong to another allied one. This is exactly analogous to the variety which exists in most, although not all, our domesticated animals.

With wild animals the character of each species is distinct and nearly invariable, so that when we describe a single pair at different ages we describe the whole species. With man we can only obtain an average by the comparison of many individuals, and that average, from the complexity of the subject, it is very difficult to strike.

In attempting to define the different races or species, the points for consideration are—the complexion, the quality and quantity of the hair of the head and of other parts of the body, the colour and shape of the eye, the features, or (as defined by Dr. Johnson) “the cast and make of the face”, the form of the person, the stature, the skeleton, and especially the skull the receptacle of the brain, and finally, the intellectual capacity. In most of these a very wide disparity will be found to exist.

In colour the skin ranges from the pure clear white of the Scandinavian to the ebony black of the Congo negro. Even within the same species there is always a wide range in the complexion. The language which we employ in describing the colour of different species—not to say that it is constantly varying even in the same species—is quite inadequate to convey a clear and distinct idea of the reality. We use the terms black, fair, yellow, red, brown, nut-brown, olive, cinnamon colour, copper colour, mahogany colour, swarthy, sallow, coal-black, sooty-black. These terms are, in fact, but approximations to the varieties in the tints of the human complexion, which are so great, and pass so insensibly from one shade to another, as to baffle description by words and even by painting.

Climate, I think, it may safely be asserted, has no permanent influence in the production of colour in the human complexion. It has pleased the Creator—for reasons to us inscrutable—to plant certain fair races in the temperate regions of Europe, and there only, and certain black ones in the tropical and sub-tropical regions of Africa and Asia, to the exclusion of white ones, but it is certain that climate has nothing to do with the matter. The Laplanders are much darker than the Norwegians, although

much nearer to the Pole, or with less sun. In the same latitude with fair Swedes we find olive-coloured Kalmucks. At the same distance from the equator we find fair Europeans, yellow Chinese, red Americans, and black Australians. The Hindus are black, the Hindu-Chinese brown, and the Chinese yellow, in the very same parallels of latitude. The Chinese do not vary in complexion over thirty degrees of latitude. The Hindus of the Punjab, thirty-five degrees distant from the equator, are as dark as those about Cape Cormorin, which is little more than eight degrees from it. The Malays under the equator are far fairer than the Hindus who dwell under parallels corresponding with those of the south of Europe. But to give an extreme case, these Malays of the equator are nearly of the same complexion with the Esquimaux of the arctic circle. In the whole New World, there was no black man and no white one.

As to the hair of the head, the beard, and the hair of other parts of the body, variety in colour prevails only with the races of Europe and those of contiguous parts of Western Asia, and with them we find it of every tint, from flaxen to black. With the rest of mankind it is always black. With the European races, the hair of the head is usually soft, silky, and buckling. With the races of the continent of Asia, of America, and generally with the Malayan and Polynesian nations, it is long, lank, and coarse. With the negroes of Africa it is short and woolly, covering the whole scalp. With the Oriental negroes it is also woolly in texture, but it grows in long isolated tufts.

With all the races of Europe, of Central Asia, and of Hindustan, the beard is usually abundant. With all the races of Tartary, with the Chinese and Hindu-Chinese, it is scanty, while with the Malays, the Polynesians, and Americans, it consists only of a few scattered hairs usually extirpated. The beard with the African negro is short, woolly, and scanty, corresponding with the hair of the head. It is more abundant with the Papuan negro, and considerable in amount with the Australian. The abundance or scantiness of the hair on other parts of the person corresponds with the beard.

The eye corresponds in colour with the skin and hair, and this varies only with the European races, among whom we find it grey, blue, azure, brown, hazel, black, while with the rest of mankind it is invariably black. The position of the eye in the Chinese, the nations of Tartary, and the Malays, is oblique, while with the nations of Europe, of Central Asia, and India, it is horizontal. As each category would embrace many different races, this last distinction is of small value.

The features of the face are of infinite variety even within the same race. Painting and photography may represent them,

but they are indescribable by language. The most remarkable difference between races is in the nose. With the races of Europe, of Central Asia, and of India, it is elevated and symmetrical. With the Chinese, the Mongolian races, and Malays, it is low, short and snubby, giving the appearance of flatness to the whole face. In the African negroes it is large and very flat. With the American and Polynesian it is elevated, but not symmetrical.

The mouth of the African negro is easily distinguished by its projection, the obliquity of the teeth, and the great thickness of the lips, but beyond this I do not believe that the mouth would furnish a distinctive character for the other races of man.

With respect to stature, there is little difference between the great majority of mankind — Europeans, Hindus, Chinese, Americans, African negroes, and Polynesians being nearly of the same height. The Malayan race, however, is by three inches short of this standard. The Esquimaux are under five feet; and some negroes of the Malayan peninsula and Philippines even shorter.

A symmetrical form of person characterizes most of the races of man, as those of Europe, of Central Asia, of India, of China, of America, and of Polynesia, but a squab and ungainly one of others, as the Malays and Tartars.

In bodily strength there is no great disparity between the different races of Europe, who in this respect excel all others. No race comes so near those of Europe as the African negro. Some forty years ago, one of this race had nearly carried off the championship of England in the prize-ring, and with fair treatment, it is said, would have done so. An individual of any other race would have had no chance in such a contest. The Chinese and Hindus are of the same stature, but the personal strength of the Chinese is far greater than that of the Hindus. A native of New Zealand, a favourable specimen of the Polynesian race, is of the same stature and same breadth of chest with an Englishman, but the Englishman is superior to him in strength. Mr. Thomson, the intelligent author of *The Story of New Zealand*, found, on trial, that Englishmen could, on an average, raise fifty pounds of a heavy weight an inch from the ground beyond what could be accomplished by New Zealanders.

In the anatomical structure of man there is a common agreement, to which there is but a single exception, consisting in two remarkable peculiarities of the Hottentot, gratuitously supposed to be mere congenital varieties, as equally gratuitously is imagined to be the fatty tail of a particular breed of sheep. As, however, these peculiarities are general in the race, and

found in no others, not even that inhabiting the same land, the Caffre, we must consider it as not accidental but primordial.

With respect to intellectual capacity, the differences between races is very great, a truth so patent that it is hardly necessary to insist upon it. If all the races of man were mere varieties of one pristine stock, we must be prepared to admit, as a corollary, that nature had allowed great degeneracy to take place in some or great improvement in others.

The difference in mental capacity between races can only be fairly tested by a comparison of their achievements under equal external conditions, for assuredly there is no ground whatever for the supposition that some races, being of earlier creation than others, have consequently enjoyed a longer time to mature civilization. The Egyptians, the Hindus, and Chinese were probably placed in a condition equally favourable. They had all three fertile soils, rivers fit for irrigation and intercommunication, products animal, vegetable, and mineral, adapted for elaboration, with temperate climates. Notwithstanding this apparently absolute equality of conditions, the fruits were different in quality and in magnitude, and for practical utility it may be fairly asserted that the Chinese have excelled both Egyptians and Hindus.

The Hindu-Chinese race, with apparently the same advantages of fertile lands and navigable rivers as the Hindus and Chinese, are in civilization far below both of them.

Some of the inhabitants of the New World were placed by nature in a state perhaps as favourable to the development of civilization as the ancient people of Egypt, but they were, when first seen by Europeans, very far from having made the same advance as the Egyptians had made four thousand years before. Little more than two centuries ago certain European colonies began to be planted in the same New World, and this not in the most genial part of it, and within the short time which has elapsed they have grown into a great nation, equalling any, and excelling in civilization most of the nations of Europe.

The negroes of Africa have never attained the civilization of the Egyptians and Mauritanians of the same continent. They never invented letters, and very rarely adopted those of strangers. Equal in bodily strength to Europeans, but inferior not only to them, but even to most Asiatic nations in mental capacity, they have permitted themselves to become the bondsmen of the latter long before Europeans engaged in the nefarious practice of enslaving them. In the large and fertile island of St. Domingo they have been free from the yoke of slavery and of strangers for half a century, but are still barbarians.

The negroes of the Islands of the Pacific, inhabiting lands as fertile and as much abounding in the requisites to civilization as those inhabited by the Polynesians of brown complexion, are invariably found in a lower state of civilization than the latter, a difference which can hardly be attributed to any other cause than inferior mental endowment, since in stature and bodily strength they are equal, if not superior.

But there are, in some cases, physical and geographical obstacles to the early advancement of civilization, which, however high the natural quality of the race, it is difficult to suppose could have been overcome without the example of more civilized ones. In the cold climate and deep forests of Germany, Gaul, Britain, and Scandinavia, the same early development could not be reasonably looked for as in the genial climates of Greece, Italy, and Egypt, and there civilization was chiefly owing to Roman example. Russia is a still more striking case. Its civilization has been chiefly owing to the influence and example of the more advanced nations of Europe, more especially of the Germans, and is of very recent origin, still going on, indeed, under our own eyes.

A few instances exist in which both race and conditions are so unfavourable, that any respectable amount of civilization would seem hopeless. The Esquimaux and the inhabitants of the Frozen Ocean are of this description, dwelling, as they do, in a region of ice and snow, and with a night of half the year's length; and so excluded from every agricultural pursuit, civilization was impossible. To great intellectual inferiority of race, the inhabitants of Australia, of New Guinea, and of the Andaman Islands, laboured under the privations of alimentary plants amenable to culture, and of animals amenable to domestication, and they were found to be seemingly irreclaimable savages.

By some writers it has been asserted that no civilization would anywhere have sprung up without an example being set, but this is an untenable doctrine; for surely at least one independent, indigenous civilization must have spontaneously arisen somewhere to set the required example. In fact, many different categories of civilization have sprung up at many independent points. Taking the invention or adoption of written language as the test, we can enumerate the civilizations of Egypt, Greece, Italy, Assyria, Persia, Indo-China, China, Japan, and the Indian Archipelago. These, no doubt, varied greatly in strength, and some of them required help from others, but still they were essentially of independent origin.

The incomparable superiority of the European races over those of Asia, and still more over those of Africa and America,

is an undeniable fact. In the case of the Asiatic races, we have the history of five-and-twenty centuries in proof. Alexander, with an army of about 30,000 Greeks, subdued the most potent nations of Asia up to the Western confines of India. We ourselves, with numbers probably not exceeding 100,000, maintain dominion over 200,000,000 of Indians; and with a force not greater than that of Alexander, two European nations are now dictating humiliating terms to a people numbering 400,000,000, who were clothed in silk when the forefathers of the invaders were clad in the skins of wild beasts, and both their countries permanently subdued by a few Roman legions.

A wide difference in the intellectual faculties of the different species of the human family is, then, a fact beyond all question, and there exists no valid evidence in this respect any more than in respect to physical form to show that the diversity was otherwise than primordial.

In classing and defining the races of man, philology has been much relied on. It is valuable in tracing migrations, settlements, and conquests, but as evidence of race, it is not implicitly to be relied on; and the reasons are obvious. Speech is a mere acquirement—the result of the innate faculties of the human mind—like any other adventitious acquisition flowing from the same cause. If it were intrinsic, it would, like laughing and weeping, be the same throughout the whole human family. Instead of being so, languages are far more diverse than races themselves; for in the very same race innumerable distinct languages are found to be spoken. This is strikingly exemplified in the languages of the Red man of America, of the negroes of Africa, of the Malayan race, and in the many tongues of Australia, in each of which cases the race is unquestionably the same, and different from all others.

Other evidence to the same effect is abundant. Young children of one race can learn the language of another race, to the exclusion of the parental tongue,—can forget that, and acquire another tongue; or dropping this also, can end in learning the language of their parents.

Race may, indeed, exist without language. It does so in infants, because the brain is yet without the power of acquiring it, just as the legs are without the power of walking. The congenital deaf are destitute of language, because they are without the organ for making the acquisition; but a deaf and dumb Negro or Hindu is not less of the Negro or Hindu race because wanting the faculty of speech. Although born deaf, they belong to them, as much as do Albinos of the same races, although born without the colouring matter of the skin and hair.

A race may lose its original tongue and come to speak a

foreign idiom—a fact of which we have many examples. The Jews speak the languages of the many races among whom they are settled, and no section of them speaks the language of the Pentateuch, or any modification of it. The Egyptians speak Arabic nearly to the loss of their original tongue. Dialects springing from a single language of Italy have gone far towards superseding the many tongues which were spoken in Italy, France, and Spain two thousand years ago. A German tongue with an admixture of Latin, is now the language of the great majority of the people of Britain, superseding, in a great measure, the tongues spoken by the aboriginal inhabitants of the island. Assuredly we do not conclude from these facts that the ancient Egyptians were of the Arabian race, the aboriginal people of France and Spain of Italian, or those of Britain of the German. What we should infer, even if we did not know it to be historically true, is simply that the countries in question were long in the occupation of foreign invaders, who mixed their blood largely with that of the original inhabitants, resulting in the production of a hybrid population originating in races distinct, yet nearly allied.

When man was first called into existence, we may conjecture that he was planted over the earth in many small families or groups, often consisting of distinct species, or when not so of a single species, adapted to a variety of climates. To be thus few in number and widely dispersed was necessary to his preservation, since otherwise, in his first helpless condition, he would not have been able to supply himself with food and clothing, and protect himself from ferocious animals. In such an isolated state, each little group would construct its own separate language, in the same manner in which it gave a peculiar form to its wigwam, its club, its bow, and its canoe, and hence the multiplicity of tongues, and the variety in their words and structures.

In the earlier periods of man's existence, languages were, therefore, very numerous, and in the progress of society we know that they have been constantly diminishing in number, being always few in proportion to civilization, and numerous in proportion to barbarism.

Diminution in the number of languages is, of course, the result of conquest. A strong tribe subdues a weak one, and either exterminates it along with its language, or imposes upon it its own tongue. Many examples of the total disappearance of languages have taken place in the New World, even within the short period which has elapsed since its discovery. Many of the islands of the Pacific Ocean are peopled by a single race speaking the same language. This could only be the result of

migration—could only have taken place after advancement in society had conferred the skill and strength necessary to its accomplishment. Some of the islands in question are of considerable, and two of them, the New Zealand isles, of great size. Unless, then, unlike most other parts of the world, they were altogether destitute of human inhabitants, we must suppose them to have been peopled by their own aborigines, who, with their languages, were exterminated by invaders.

Some languages have been preserved only through the art of writing. In intelligent Europe we know who the people were who spoke and the countries in which were spoken Hebrew, Egyptian, and Latin, but in puerile and inconstant Asia, we cannot exactly tell the nation and race that spoke, or the countries in which were spoken, Sanskrit, Zend, and Pali, although these were once vernacular tongues as much as were Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.

From all that has now been stated, I think it must be obvious that to classify mankind—as naturalists do the lower animals in the wild state—is hopeless. Such a classification with the lower animals in the domestic state is admitted to be impracticable, and with man, ever in the domestic state, the difficulty opposed to such an arrangement cannot be less. Such attempts, however, have been made, the most remarkable of which is that of Cuvier and Blumenbach, modified by Prichard. These writers consider man as one genus and one species, and the divergences from a supposed original type, or stock, not as distinct species, but mere varieties, the result of time and chance, and such as are of frequent occurrence, not in the genera, but in the species of the lower domesticated animals.

The varieties of Cuvier and Blumenbach consist of five only, those of Prichard of seven, the many divergences from these imagined primary types being considered as sub-varieties. The very names given to the primary varieties involve hypothesis and error. The first variety of Cuvier and Blumenbach, embracing the people of Europe and others supposed to resemble them, and which is fancied to be the stock from which the other four proceeded, these writers call the Caucasian, after the Range of the Caucasus. This supposes the first man to have been planted in a mountain region, of all others the locality most likely to breed a home-keeping and rude population, destitute of the capacity and enterprise which would impel it to migrate and people the earth. It supposes, moreover, that the inhabitants of the Caucasus exhibit the most perfect examples of the human form,—a gratuitous and groundless hypothesis.

Prichard rejects the term Caucasian, and adopts that of

Iranian, equally theoretical, in its stead. This is derived from Iran, a mythic name of Persia, and of course, it transfers the first cradle of man from the Caucasian Range to Persia. This also is founded on a very wild theory, namely, that the Persians, Hindus, and Europeans—the brown, the black, and the fair men, who, as far as our experience extends, have ever been, psychologically as well as physically different—belong to one and the same stock, and this because the features of their faces and the shape of their skulls have a common resemblance, and because there is an agreement, or supposed agreement, in a few words of the many languages of some of them. Prichard converts the Mongolian variety of his predecessors into the Turanian, but the change is very far from an improvement. The term is the correlative of Iran, and refers to the country lying immediately east of Persia, which, instead of containing a race of Mongols or Tartars, is peopled by one much resembling the Persians themselves, and belonging rightfully, therefore, to his first variety.

Such classifications as these are purely arbitrary,—indeed, purely imaginary. In the same category we find placed men as different from each other as are the different species of bears, wolves, and foxes, or of oaks or palms. Blumenbach, for example, places the Australians and the Africans of Madagascar among his Malays, the three people being as remote from each other as any races of mankind that could well be named. Both writers place in the same variety Europeans, Persians, Syrians, Arabs, and Hindus, for no other reason than that their skulls and features bear some resemblance.

Blumenbach has no distinct place for the Oriental negroes, whom he seems to ignore, as if they had no existence. Prichard makes them and the Hottentots two distinct varieties, and hence the two varieties which he adds to those of Blumenbach and Cuvier. These authors have a Malayan variety, but Prichard none. The latter, however, has a variety of his own which he denominates the Alforian, but this turns out to be an invention, for no such people as Alfoers exists. Alfoers (sometimes written Aarafora) is the corruption of the Portuguese Alfora, applied by the Portuguese of the Indian Archipelago to any wild insular tribe whatsoever. The word is derived, to all appearance, from the Arabic article *al*, and the preposition *fora*, without, and literally signifies the people beyond the pale of Portuguese jurisdiction. These Alfoers may be indifferently Negroes or Malays, yet in this imaginary class Prichard includes the Australians, who are neither the one nor the other.

Seeing such monstrous incongruities, one is not surprised to find that in his *Cosmos* Baron Humboldt—who had the tra-

velled experience which Cuvier, Blumenbach, and Prichard wanted—pronounces their arrangements as possessing “no typical rigour” and “no recognisable principle of natural classification.”

The skull is the portion of the human body which has been more especially relied on as a test of the variety of races. We are told that that of the Caucasian variety is oval and symmetrical, that of the negro narrow and elongated, that of the Mongolian pyramidal, etc., etc. But these are vague and general terms which admit of many gradations, while one form runs so insensibly into another that the skull of a Malay may be easily taken for that of an Esquimaux, or even that of an European for that of an African negro. Prichard has denominated the Mongolian form of skull “the pyramidal,” and the negro “the prognathous,” or “snouty;” but these technical terms contribute no more to the extent or precision of our knowledge than his melanous, xanthous, and leucous—his Iranian and Turanian varieties, for they are all alike vague and factitious, their utter worthlessness not being the less because they are veiled in a kind of scientific language.

For the last half century a vast amount of anatomical skill and labour has been exercised upon the skull, in the hope—always defeated—of making it a distinctive test of race. No one has contributed more to this than Dr. George Williamson, who has written an elaborate essay on the subject. This careful observer examined no fewer than 549 skulls from almost every country in the world, as they exist in the Military Museum of Chatham; but it is clear from the result that he has been wholly unable to frame any lucid arrangement.

Dr. Williamson appears to adopt the arrangement of the Chatham Museum, which divides skulls into four classes only—namely, skulls which are oval and symmetrical—skulls which are prognathous or snouty—skulls which have remarkably prominent superciliary ridges, and skulls with broad and flat faces. This very summary and purely arbitrary classification forces into the same category races admitted to be distinct, while it separates races admitted to be the same. It seems to me to have no value whatever, unless it be to prove that the form of the skull is no test of race at all. It places such discordant races as Europeans, Hindus, Arabs, and Assyrians in the same class. Under the same head we have in it people so utterly different as Chinese, Burmese, Esquimaux, and Red Indians. It classes African negroes with Papuans and Australians, and it places in separate categories Sandwich Islanders, Tahitians, and New Zealanders, well ascertained to be of one and the same race. It is not the arrangement of Blumenbach

or of Prichard, but it is productive of as much confusion as either of them.

Dr. Williamson himself, indeed, appears incidentally to admit the inadequacy of his classification. Four out of fifteen Caffre skulls which he examined, he says, "display the European characters in every particular. Some even resemble the best-formed Greek skulls." Of the remaining eleven, he tells us that they are "intermediate between the negro and European." He places the Australians, and this simply on account of the prominence of the jaws, in the same class as the African negroes, and yet he thus describes their skulls:—"They are large, oval skulls, with an oval face, and with the exception of the projecting alveolar processes, they have not one point of resemblance to the negro." The Australian skull, according to his account, is, in fact, European, and ought to have contained European brains, which it assuredly did not.

In the Chatham Museum there are eighty-seven skulls of natives of our own islands, and of these Dr. Williamson says: "I have not thought it necessary to separate the English, Scots, and Irish, as the races are now so mixed, that if there were ever any difference or peculiarity in the conformation of their crania, this has now become inappreciable." I have myself no doubt that if the races had been ever so unmixed, there would have been no appreciable difference in their skulls; and in this case, what would be the value of the skull in distinguishing Celt from Saxon?

The facial angle of Camper, once in much vogue, has long fallen into merited disrepute. Depending almost wholly on the mere form of the face, and excluding the seat of the brain, it necessarily excluded whatever the form or bulk of the brain could tell of the intellectual quality of a race. The angle, owing to the projection of the jaws, is acute in the African negro, and in a lesser degree in the Oriental negro and Australian, but in the great majority of mankind it cannot be shown that there is any appreciable difference at all.

Dr. Williamson, the careful scientific inquirer above quoted, has given us nearly sixty measurements of the facial angle. According to Camper's method, which includes the lower jaw, the following are examples. At the top of the scale stands the German, with an angle of 78.30; and next to him, and differing from him by no more than 1.5, stands a Hottentot, who is by no less than 4.19 better than a Greek, whose skull is usually considered the model form. An Australian skull is better than a Chinese by four decimals, and a Burmese skull excels an English one by two decimals.

The measurement of the cranium, excluding the lower jaw,

gives very different, but equally fallacious results: here, too, the German is at the top of the scale, standing at 87.80, or nine degrees higher than with the lower jaw. The Greek skull is no less than 4.28 below the German, and the English as much as 6.80. The Albanian, the Australian, and the Chinese skull are on a level. French, Spanish, and Polynesian skulls have the same angle, and this is, by 1.20, below that of the Australian skull. The skull of the Sandwich Islander is by one degree higher than that of the New Zealander, the two skulls belonging to parties notoriously of the same race of man. Than the facial angle, then, no more ingenious contrivance for insuring disorder could in my judgment be well imagined.

The cranial capacity which refers to the bulk, but neither to the form or quantity of the brain, would seem to promise better as an indication of races than the mere outward shape of the skull, is, I suspect, little to be trusted. Dr. Morton, a skilful and careful inquirer, made a long series of experiments on the subject, and has given us the results. The following are some of the principal ones. The average cranial capacity of Australian skulls was found to be 75 cubic inches; of Oceanic negroes, or Papuans, 76 inches; of ancient Egyptians, 80 inches; of native Americans, 80.3 inches; of African negroes, 82.25 inches; of Persians and Armenians, 84; of Chinese, 85; of Hindus, 86; of Celts, represented by Irishmen, 87; of the Esquimaux, 89; of the Arab, 89; and of the German or Teuton, 95.

In a few of the cases thus cited the quantity of the brain would seem to correspond with its quality, as in the examples at the top and bottom of the scale, but in the greater number of instances the test is clearly most fallacious. We cannot, for example, believe that the ancient Egyptians who invented letters were inferior to the African negroes who never did so. We cannot believe that the Hindus and Malays have better brains than Chinese, simply because they have bulkier ones. Still less can we admit that an Esquimaux brain is better than an Irish one, because it is by two cubic inches more in quantity.

By the view of the mere skull, or indeed of the entire skeleton, the most skilful comparative anatomist cannot distinguish the different species of the canine, bovine, or equine families. He cannot tell whether the skull before him be that of a dog, a wolf, a jackal, or a fox. He cannot tell whether an ox's skull is that of the wild yak of Tibet, or of any one of the several wild oxen of India and its islands. He cannot distinguish between the skulls of horses, asses, and zebras. If the skull be a fossil one, he readily tells that it belongs to the canine, bovine, or equine family, but he cannot tell whether to a living or extinct species of these.

If the inquiry of the comparative anatomist should extend to the varieties of the animals in question produced by domestication, his embarrassment and helplessness would only be increased, yet man is in the same domesticated condition as these, while the affinity of the races is far closer. What, therefore, is impossible with the lower animals must be equally so with man, and it follows that the skull, viewed in whatever aspect, is, as a test of race, utterly illusory.

Deep in the stalagmite of certain caves on the Continent there have lately been discovered human skulls, along with bones of the mastodon and other extinct animals, with which they are pronounced by eminent naturalists to be contemporary. Some observers are disposed to consider those skulls to have belonged to a race of man different from those who have inhabited Europe within the historic period. I cannot agree with them, and do not doubt but that they will be found to differ in no material respect from the skulls found in ancient tumuli, or in even modern churchyards.

Although neither the skull or any other single character is sufficient to distinguish the races of man—nor indeed, in the majority of cases, all possible characters combined, still there are a few instances—generally those of rude and isolated tribes—in which the distinction of races seems clear enough. Among these may be reckoned the Australians, the negroes of New Guinea, those of New Ireland, those of Mallicollo one of the Cylades, those of Tanna one of the New Hebrides, those of the Fiji Islands, those of the Andaman Islands, those of the Malayan Peninsula, those of the Philippines and those of Madagascar, the Bhutias, the Tibetians, the Polynesians, the Kamchatcadales, the Alutian Islanders, the Hottentots, and the Esquimaux. Here, then, instead of the five races of Cuvier and Blumenbach, or the seven of Prichard, we have no fewer than seventeen well defined ones, widely differing among themselves, and distinct from the rest of mankind.

These rude races, however, embrace but a small portion of mankind, and we have large groups in which the race is sufficiently distinct, and the variations very trifling. These include the Chinese, the Japanese, the Hindu-Chinese, the Hindus, the Malays, the native Americans, the Mauritians or Berbers, and the Egyptians. These, although not so free from variety as the rude races above named, may still be considered as primordial species, and, if so, the total number will rise to five-and-twenty.

Other large groups are more diversified, such as the European, the African negro, the Persian, the Syrian, and the Arab. Some of these contain within themselves races, probably as distinct

at their creation, although closely allied, as Australians or Polynesians. In the European, for example, we have the Slavonic, the German or Teutonic, the Celtic, the Greek, the Italian, and, very probably, the Spanish or Iberian. The African negro is still more split into races, such as the Caffres and Zullas.

These, however, are not all the races that might be enumerated, for north of the chain of the Himalaya up to the Frozen Ocean there are many tribes which, although agreeing in some respects with the Mongols, differ from them essentially in corporeal and mental endowments. In Western Asia, we find races resembling Europeans, but palpably differing from them, such as Circassians, Georgians, and Armenians; while to the north of Europe we have the Laplanders, and in Africa, the Nubians and Abyssinians.

Here, then, we have some forty races of man, which, to pack into the five pigeon-holes of Cuvier and Blumenbach, or the seven of Prichard, would produce confusion instead of order.

Often the disparity between races is so conspicuous, that there can be no question of their being perfectly distinct varieties, or even species, as in the example of the European and the African negro, or of the Hindu and the Chinese. On the other hand, some races so much resemble each other, that they may easily be mistaken. An Esquimaux within the Arctic Circle bears a close resemblance to a Malay under the Equator; and a negro of New Guinea has been mistaken for a negro of Old Guinea, although 12,000 miles of ocean divide the two races.

From all that has been stated in this paper, I must come to the conclusion that, to classify the races of man as we do the genera and species of wild plants and animals, is wholly beyond our power, and that the attempts hitherto made with this view are unscientific and delusory.